Mr. Tom Wicker
The New York Times
229 W. 43 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10036

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
12/22/91

Dear Mr. Wicker,

Perhaps you may remember that about 26 years ago, after reading the manuscript of my first book, which was the first on the Warren Commission, you tried to encourage W.W. Norton to publish it. They decided that I should reorganize it into what amounted to charging the government with the JFK assassination. I refused and published the book myself. Since then I have opposed the multitude of conspiracy theories presented, as Oliver Stone now does, as solutions to the crime.

I write on the chance that you have gotten flak over your excellent review and commentary of a week ago and would like to respond.

Like his film's hero Jim Garrison Stone has trouble telling the truth even by accident. His campaign of pretended CIA/ Eastern Establishment/ "Recipied" reporters out to get him is to his knowledge false. He knows very well that after warning him I was responsible for the exposures and that, after the first and fine one by George Lardner, it was as it should have been a self-sustaining story.

(Apologies for my typing. I'm not almost 79, seriously impaired, must keep my legs elevated when I'm not using them, and thus the typewriter is to one side.)

What seems to have escaped reportorial and critic/ recollection is that when Stone announced his movie he told the world that it would record their history for the people and would tell them who killed their President, why and how. He also announced that he was basing his film on Garrison's "On the Trail of the Assassins," to my personal knowledge the one trail he never took.

I then wrote Stone in some detail to inform him that Garrison's book was of intended and permeating dishonesty. I gave him several illustrations and provided some documentation, offered more if he wanted it, and said I'd respond to all questions he might have. He did not respond. That was 2/8/91, almost two months before he started shooting.

Included in what I told Stone and offered to document, because I prevented it, is how Garrison planned to commemorate the fifth assassination anniversary, unrecognizable and lied about in the book. He was going to charge Robert Perrin, the former husband of a Warren Commission witness, Nancy Perrin Rich, who had killed himself - to Garrison's knowledge, in New Orleans, in 1962 - with being a 1963 assassin!

This is to say that, consistent with crude and overt commercialization and exploitation that I have not seen commented on, Stone had no innocence when he proceeded with a fraud and a travesty.

To open the subject I gave George Lardner a copy of an early script and whatever he wanted of my Garrison files, including details of my investigation and its documentation

that aborted Garrison's incredible "commemoration." In the book this comes out as his having to fire Bill Boxley when his staff discovered that Boxley had infiltrated the "probe" to wreck it for the CIA. It appeared this way in the script I had.

Stone demanded and was given exceptional courtesies by the Post. When his response appeared I wrote him again, taking it point by point and leaving it without question that he didn't know what he was talking about and didn't care, that he just said whatever then appeared to be expedient. (He always does this.)

He did not respond but I got a letter from the woman who signed herself as his "research coordinator" that includes a thinly-veiled offer of a bribe. I rejected it.

Both of Lardner's Outlook articles were completely accurate and more than fair.

Stone's piece not only reflects ignorance - he lied and knew he lied. His record since I started all of this is that of an unashamed liar.

One of Stone's continuing lies is that he uses all that has come to light in his film, saying at the same time that the government is suppressing all its relevant records until the year 2039 at the earliest. The fact is that he had no interest at all in fact and what he refers to as "information" is in fact the unproven, mostly untenable and not infrequently irrational, conspiracy theories. He knew because it is well known in the field and because I told him in my first letter that I alone, without having all, have about a quarter of a million pages of these "suppressed" records gotten by a series of FOIA lawsuits. He and his hangers-on and staff also knew, as everyone working in the field knows, that I provide unsupervised access and the use of our copier to all who write on the subject.

He had no interest in this not insignificant documentation and he asked for nothing, not even that a single allegation be checked.

I do not take more of your time now but if you want to write more about Stone and his movie and his and its defenders, you are welcome to copies of all that I have relating to this. So also is anyone else at the Times.

Again my thanks for your effort to help get the first book on the Warren Commission published. It remains the only factual, as distinguished from conspiracy-theorizing, book on the subject still available. It and my other five books on that subject.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg